

380578

**Continental  
Airlines**



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759) - 325

OST-03-15759-325  
Docket Operations  
Nassif Building  
Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: Robert Anderson

Address: 361 Harbor Ct  
Avon Lake, OH 44012



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

*Susan Berg*  
Name: 6034 Laurel Ln

Address:

Olmsted Falls OH  
44138



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control (Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.


I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

  
Shaughnessy Carroll

Address:

143 Lake Forest Dr.  
Newnan, GA 30265

Continental  
Airlines



2006 JAN -6 P 2:57

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

*William F. Redden*

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards, Linda Valentine

Name: Linda Valentine

Address: Continental Airlines  
5300 Riverside Drive  
Cleveland, Ohio 44135

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

*Bob MacMillan*

Address:

*Co. Airlines  
5300 Riverside Drive  
Cler Ohio 44135*

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name:

Kristi A. Green

Address:

8610 Evergreen Trail #104  
Olived Top Of 44138

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on *actual control* of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.


I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

  
Julie A. Bank  
6300 Riverside Dr.  
Cleveland, OH 44135



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.


I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.


I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: 

Address: 



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control (Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.


Regards,

Name:

CHARLES HOWARD (Rt)

Address:

HAYWARD LA.  
E. ORLEANS, MA. 02643



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control (Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.


Regards,

Name:

ROBERT J. HORDESKY

Address:

12260 ARCTURUS DR  
WILLIS, TX 77318



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control (Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Willard E. Shaw Jr

Address:

1371 Wildwood Dr

Wooster, OH 44691



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control (Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Bob Daniels

Address:

12597 Arroyo Loop  
Willis TX 77231



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control (Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.


For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

*Leonard A. Zink*

Name: Leonard Zink

Address: 923 Coventry Ct.  
Medina OH 44256



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control (Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

KURT RUTENBERGS

Address:

20512 BEACONSFIELD BLVD

ROCKY RIVER, OH 44116



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

*Anna B. Foster*  
*Jim Hosta # 57000*  
*1930 Ridge Rd,*

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: *Charlin Elms CAPT 0456P*

Address: *316 POWDERIDGE CIRCLE  
WAYZATA, MN 55391*

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: *Felix J. Nazario*

Address:

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.


I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

  
B. TAL AFENO  
3147 Bester Rd  
Ch OH 44120

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

*Deborah Malik*

Name:

Address:

*406 Beeler Dr.*

*Berea, OH 44017*

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.


I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

  
KATHLEEN W. LACHAPELLE  
5300 Riverside Dr.  
Cleveland, OH 44135

Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.


I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

  
Ryan McDonald  
5580 Rosemont Way  
Medina OH 44256



Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Capt. Stephen D. Arnold  
Chief Pilot-CLE

5533 Bertram Drive  
Port Clinton, Ohio  
43452





Docket Operations  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Nassif Building, Room PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control  
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address: